

**Lewis County Planning Commission  
Public Hearing  
Lewis County Courthouse  
351 NW North St.  
Chehalis, WA 98532**

**October 12, 2010  
Meeting Notes**

**Planning Commissioners Present:** Bill Russell, Mike Mahoney, Bob Guenther, Rachael Jennings, Richard Tausch, Arny Davis

**Planning Commissioners Excused:** Jim Lowery

**County Commissioners Present:** Bill Schulte

**Staff Present:** Bob Johnson, Glenn Carter, Barbara Kincaid, Mike Kroll, Kim Amrine, Pat Anderson

**Others Present:** Please see sign in sheet

**Handouts/Materials Used:**

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from September 14, 15, 29 and October 5
- Staff Report from Phil Rupp re: Application #156
- Memo from Phil Rupp re: Rezone Matrix
- Errata Sheet
- Rezone Matrix
- Memo from Phil Rupp re: Countywide Planning Policies
- Redline version of Countywide Planning Policies
- Countywide Planning Policies and Population Allocation Chart
- Correspondence J Vander Stoep
- Correspondence from Ramona Sheppard
- Correspondence from Larry Smith

**I. Call to order**

Chairman Jennings called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. The Planning Commissioners introduced themselves.

Commissioner Russell stated tonight was Barb Kincaid's last meeting. He thanked her for her hard work and diligent service and stated she would be missed.

Chairman Jennings stated Ms. Kincaid would be missed and it would be a loss for Lewis County but a great gain for the COG [Council of Governments].

**II. Old Business**

**A. Approval of meeting notes**

Chairman Jennings entertained a motion to approve the meetings notes from September 14, 15, 29 and October 5. Commissioner Russell made the motion; it was seconded and carried unanimously.

### **III. New Business**

#### **A. Workshop on Lewis County STIP**

Chairman Jennings stated she would deviate from the agenda to allow Public Works to present their six year transportation plan. She recognized Mr. Mike Kroll.

Mr. Kroll stated a couple of months ago Mr. Kroll presented the requirements of the six year program to the Planning Commission and how projects are derived. Tonight he would show the six year program that will be presented to the Board of County Commissioners on November 15 for approval.

Mr. Kroll spoke of the projects that were completed in 2010. These included miscellaneous safety and guardrail work, repair on the Pe Ell MacDonald Rd, flexible guide posts and lane markers, some federal forest road improvements which included pavement repair and overlay, overlays on Salzer Valley Road, and some paving on Jackson Highway. Approximately 67 miles of road was chip sealed, including the last of the roads that needed servicing from the floods. There was some cement treated base stabilization and chip seal on Birley Road and Gish Road.

The preliminary construction budget for the 2011 TIP is \$8.99 million with a total six year budget of \$56.67 million. There are still eight flood-related projects on the STIP that total \$5.84 million and comprise 10.3% of the six year TIP.

Mr. Kroll presented a PowerPoint that showed all the proposed funded projects through 2013, their locations, costs and types of funding available for each.

Mr. Kroll stated one of the projects is work on the forest roads. Commissioner Russell wanted to point out that work on the forest roads is not for the forest; they are shared rights of way and the forest and county share those roads. Mr. Kroll stated the road between Packwood and Ashford has been designated as a forest highway and they applied for funding to improve that entire section.

Priority number 20 is to widen I-5 through Lewis County. This will be a federally funded project to make improvements along I-5. Potential projects include Airport Rd, Chamber Way and the Salzer Creek retention project. The Salzer Creek retention is mitigation for the Mellen Street improvements.

Priority number 26 is Airport Rd. This project ties into the State's new Mellen Street interchange. The project will run concurrently with the State's project, beginning in 2012 and ending in 2013. The County is rebuilding the portion between the State project up to and over the dike to Louisiana Avenue by Home Depot. This will make the connection between Centralia and the Home Depot/Wal Mart area and the hospital.

There are projects that are unfunded to go through 2016 plan. One project beyond 2013 that is funded and that is a RAP funded project on Highway 603, the last two miles going into Winlock from the north.

Mr. Kroll asked for questions.

Commissioner Guenther asked about the Lucas Creek culverts, whether the fish can still go through the culverts or have the culverts deteriorated too much. Mr. Kroll stated he is not certain, but the bottoms of the culverts have rotted out and what is there is actually the creek bed. When a fish passage culvert is put in, the County must meet certain standards and currently those culverts do not meet those standards. Mr. Kroll stated the fish can still get through there.

Commissioner Mahoney asked how it is determined where the fish passage culverts are needed.

Mr. Kroll stated the County environmental people work with State fisheries and they let us know what the fish passage requirements are.

Commissioner Russell asked if there is a reason why there are no brush guards installed on the upstream side of the culverts to prevent the clogging of them.

Mr. Kroll stated he was not sure but assumed that would create a dam and possibly compromise the road.

Commissioner Russell stated it is a fairly common practice throughout the Forest Service and they have been fortunate with them, considering the number of them that have been installed. They stop the majority of the limbs without restricting the water, making it easier to clean them out.

Commissioner Davis stated Mr. Kroll talked about road repair from flood erosion, such as the Ceres Hill Rd project. Is there any correspondence between the County and Fish and Wildlife when you do those types of repair?

Mr. Kroll stated when work is done along a river a lot of permitting is required. The County has a fisheries person who works closely with the County environmental people and he inspects all those projects. Any time we work below ordinary high water there are a lot of requirements, including fish windows when we can go at certain times and not otherwise.

Commissioner Davis asked why the Airport Rd project so expensive [\$5 million] considering the length.

Mr. Kroll stated the road is being improved, plus we are adding an off-set bicycle/pedestrian path. Part of the money includes right-of-way. We also have to go up over the dike which will be an extensive fill, and it has to be T'd into the Airport Rd where it heads west to accommodate the golf course. It also ties into the State project.

There were no other questions and Chairman Jennings thanked Mr. Kroll for his presentation. Mr. Kroll reminded everyone that the BOCC would hold a hearing on these improvements on November 15. He left comment forms to turn in if anyone knows of roads that need attention. Mr. Kroll will review them to determine if they should be put on the program.

## **II. Old Business**

### **B. Public Hearing on Rezone Requests**

Chairman Jennings stated she would continue with the Old Business on the agenda and recognized Mr. Bob Johnson.

Mr. Johnson stated for the record, correspondence was received after the public hearing from J Vander Stoep on behalf of Forecastle Timber Company, Mr. Ron Nilson, Mr. Eugene Butler, Davis Wright Tremaine, LLP, and Ramona Sheppard. These were all regarding Application #156, the Mineral Lake Rezone. Also received was a letter from Mr. Andy Lane, Cairncross and Hempelmann on behalf of Wasser & Winters regarding the Subarea Plan.

Mr. Johnson explained the public hearing process. There have been a number of workshops on the rezone requests. Some of the applications go back to 2002 but because of the invalidity order those

applications could not be processed. Since the invalidity order has been lifted, they can now be processed. The County updates its comprehensive plan annually and anyone wishing to have their property considered for a rezone is allowed to do that. Applications are accepted from September through December and are processed the following year, usually in December.

Mr. Johnson stated there is a matrix that the planning staff prepared. He thanked Barb Kincaid for six years with the planning staff. She hired on as an assistant planner and has worked her way up. She has been a great asset to Mr. Johnson and the County. She has a way of getting people to understand the complex issues and the County will miss her. Tonight is her last meeting and Mr. Johnson will rely heavily on her at this meeting because he has not been a part of the land use actions for several years.

Originally there were approximately 135 rezone requests that have been pared down over the years. There are about 74 requests that are in RDD zones. The map on the wall shows each rezone with a number. Staff has prepared a matrix that reflects the application number, the requested rezone, an explanation of the property and staff analysis and recommendations. Mr. Johnson emphasized that this recommendation is not necessarily the recommendation that will come from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Johnson went on to say that the meeting tonight is a public hearing and its purpose is for the volunteer Planning Commission to take testimony on land use actions and to consider all the circumstances and make a recommendation to the BOCC. The BOCC make all land use decisions after holding workshops and a public hearing.

The Planning Staff also makes recommendations based on their expertise and their interpretations of the regulations. The Planning Staff and the Planning Commission may not make the same recommendation to the BOCC.

The BOCC hearings will be held on December 13. Under the Growth Management Act, the BOCC is to consider all rezones and all comprehensive plans concurrently so they understand how those changes affect each other.

Mr. Johnson opened the floor to questions that are relative to the rezones. If anyone wants to testify, he or she can do so during the public testimony portion of the meeting.

Mr. Ron Nilson asked if there are restrictions on the number of docks that can be put on Mineral Lake.

Mr. Johnson stated that is not a part of the public hearing. That would have to do with applicable regulations under the County Shoreline Master Program.

Mr. Larry Smith stated the ground is very steep and there would be a sediment problem.

Mr. Johnson stated the question is not relative to the rezone request; however it is built into the classification criteria that the County adopts for zoning. Critical areas include steep slopes and the County has development regulations in its critical areas ordinance that regulate the type of development that can occur on steep slopes. Zoning in itself does not deal with that, but it is looked at when you consider a rezone, whether there are an abundance of critical areas in those areas. The time that those are addressed is when a development permit application is received by the County. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Carter if that information was correct. Mr. Carter stated it was correct.

Mr. Ed Brown asked if Forecastle has stated how they are going to file for a plat or file as surveyed.

Mr. Johnson stated the question has to do with land use development which is not part of a rezone request, and whether Forecastle has a proposal to do either a platted subdivision or a survey of record. Mr. Johnson stated he would answer the question even though it is not part of the rezone request. He stated he does not know but unless Forecastle requests any lots that are smaller than 5 acres, which they can't under the current zoning, there is no need under state law to do a plat. Plats only apply to lots that create 5 or more lots, any one of which is smaller than 5 acres. There is no statutory requirement for Forecastle to do a plat. Under Lewis County Large Lot Subdivision Code, any lot that is larger than 20 acres is exempt from going through the planning process.

Mr. Nilson asked if the 20 acre rezone is approved, would the applicant then be able to go down to 10 acres or 5 acres with more rezoning requests.

Mr. Johnson stated under the current regulations, the only process for 20 acre lot creation in Forest Resource Land is the local importance. Currently there is a limitation, or a time period under that provision when the applicants could opt out. It is problematic as to whether they could get zoning to a higher density.

Mr. Carter stated there would be a process for that but it would go through a new process in order to accomplish it.

[Unidentified speaker] asked if there has been an environmental impact statement completed for the rezone for the large acreage.

Mr. Johnson stated no. The County does an environmental review on the zoning changes, but there is no requirement under SEPA for an environmental impact statement.

As there were no other questions, Chairman Jennings opened the public hearing. She reminded everyone that this is not a question and answer session, and asked each speaker to identify himself or herself and spell the last name for the record. Each speaker will be allowed three minutes to speak.

Mr. Andy Lane, Cairncross and Hempelmann, spoke on behalf of Wasser and Winters Company. Mr. Lane stated there are two parcels to address: Application #108 and #110, pages 30 and 31 on the matrix. The original 2002 application included a lot of properties. Changes since then (i.e. Agricultural Resource Lands designation) have eliminated some of those properties. Some properties on which rezone requests were initially sought are now within the boundaries of the Subarea Plan. That will go through a separate process and Wasser and Winters believe it is more appropriate for most of those properties to be considered in the context of the Subarea Plan rather than rezoning now and then changing things later.

The only rezones before the Planning Commission tonight are on two parcels. A comment letter was submitted to the Planning Commission, and a letter to Phil Rupp on July 20 was also included. It analyzes why those two properties should be rezoned. The properties are located along Sareault Rd.

One of the properties is already split zoned as a result of the ARL designation, part is RDD-5 and the other is RDD-20. The other parcel is currently RDD-20. The request is for both properties are rezoned as RDD-5. That is consistent with the staff report and what is in the matrix on pages 30 and 31.

Mr. Kevin Young and his family own 640 acres west of Chehalis, Application #171. The family has been in that area for 146 years and during that time the parcel they are requesting the rezone on has never been farmed. He asked Mr. Chris Butler to speak to this property on Mr. Young's behalf.

Mr. Chris Butler, Butler Surveying, stated the property for the rezone request encompasses two major hillsides that frame the perimeter of the dairy. Mr. Butler has segregated the exempt survey. Ownership on the north side and the south side of Highway 603 takes in hillside property only. That was done for the problem of not wanting to include ground that is most appropriately zoned agriculture from ground that is most appropriately zoned residential.

The work has been done with the benefit of soils analysis using the soil conservation maps to ensure to the best of our ability that no prime soils have been included in either of the two rezone parcels. The goal is to give the Young family higher and better use on that portion of that property, which is not suitable to agriculture, while retaining the portions of the property that are. The Young family owns 30 connections to the Newaukum Hill water system; therefore, there is existing infrastructure of a quasi-urban nature providing utilities to this property. This is an attempt to utilize the existing hook-up connections to take care of the ground that is not suited for agriculture.

Commissioner Mahoney asked Mr. Butler if he has confirmed the steepness of the slopes.

Mr. Butler stated he has not performed a topographic survey of the site. There are areas that are in excess of 20% on the southerly piece. There are probably areas that are in excess of 30% for short distances. What has been asked for is the top of the hill and the side slopes leading down into the valley where the dairy is located.

Commissioner Russell asked if Mr. Butler allowed for setbacks or buffers between the prime soil and the slopes.

Mr. Butler stated there is a natural setback because of the grading of the slope. Given that this is not a development request he does not know that it would have been appropriate to create a setback area.

Commissioner Russell stated he is trying to visualize the ground and he does not recall where the topography changes between the prime soil and the steep slopes.

Mr. Butler stated it is very apparent on the ground. We had little difficulty in deciding where the toe of the hill was. There is a historic fence along the line and he utilized that. He was able to overlay the soil conservation maps digitally into the auto cad base drawing and correlate the slopes along with the fence lines. Given the extrapolation of scale, he believes he is within 20 feet versus real data.

Mr. Larry Smith, Mineral, stated he is in favor of preserving the current zone of Forest Land of Long Term Commercial Significance. The property in question [Application #156] meets the criteria for that zone under LCC 17.30.142 through .430. He stated when Forecastle purchased the property the zoning of 80 acres parcels was clear and not disputed at the time. To claim an error in zoning now is a tactic to financially benefit the company through additional development and at the expense of the community. The community of Mineral cannot afford a public water service such as a system that was previously proposed by Lewis County, nor does the community have the resources to provide fire and other protective services that a development of approximately 32 new homes would require should a rezone occur.

Mr. Smith stated the thought of development on the north and west side of the Mineral Lake is outrageous to residents, property owners and recreational sportsmen and women who fish the lake. Mr. Smith referred to Mr. Nilson's letter to the BOCC and he supports the Department of Natural Resources purchasing the 5000 acres from Forecastle Timber for the purpose of timber harvesting, land management and public recreation. He would like the zoning to remain as it is currently zoned.

Mr. Smith provided his written testimony.

Chairman Jennings asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak.

Mr. Ron Nilson offered a water or land tour of the area to any decision makers. He is opposed to any development on the slopes of Mineral Creek and Mineral Lake. He stated if Weyerhaeuser and Westport Timber Company gave up and were not able to do it, he didn't see how anyone could do it. Mr. Nilson is going to meet with the Nisqually River Council to bring them up to speed. They have great influence on what goes on from the Nisqually delta to the Nisqually Glacier on Mt. Rainier. He hopes they will join the Cascade Conservancy Land Trust, Nisqually Land Trust, Tacoma Power and Westport Timber Company in attempting to buy this property.

This development of 2200 acres represents urban and suburban sprawl which is the main reason that the Growth Management Act came into existence. County Code and GMA would be violated by development of this property. Lake pollution would increase and the fire department would have a difficult time protecting it. The big problem is Emergency Management Services. The fire department has to provide it for the 2200 acres. With the snow and elevations it would be very difficult for the fire department to get up there. Two streams that flow into the lake would be affected.

Ms. Emily Anderson spoke to Application #156 and sustainable development. She gave a brief analysis of sustainable development. It is an action plan being used to implement the United Nations Agenda 21 program. Sustainable development seeks the step-by-step abolition of private property primarily through the implementation of wild lands project and smart growth. Implementation of the wild lands project including the destruction of dams, closures of roads and many other things. She explained equity, economy and environment.

Ms. Anderson stated if you are going to require middle class people to follow growth management practices and jump through bureaucratic hoops, everyone must also jump through them. There needs to be studies as to the impacts of the action on the local economy, the community and the safety of the citizens. This action needs to preserve important historic, cultural and natural aspects of our heritage and not be a planned smart community down the road. This will also affect the watershed management plan if the rezone even complies with it.

Mr. Hines Jeg stated he has a rezone application in for a 40-acre parcel. It was to go into long term ag but there were not the soils for that and did not have enough land for long-term sustainable agriculture. The property is surrounded by 2.5 acre and 5 acre parcels located on Jackson Highway and Highway 508. He does not think it will be an asset to the county to have a long-term farm there. He would like the rezoning to be either RDD-5 or RDD-10. He did not know the application number.

Commissioner Guenther asked Mr. Jeg to explain where his property is located. Mr. Jeg stated it is on southeast corner of Jackson Hwy and Highway 508 intersection and also borders Olson Rd.

Mr. Michael Chartrey spoke to Application #169. He has 18.66 acres on Gore Rd that he has requested to take out of ARL back to RDD-10. It has been recommended to retain as ARL because it is farmed. He grazes about 15 head of cattle; he does not farm or raise crops. He reference comments in the statement about how isolated his property is. Land to the north includes a large timber parcel but it is not fronted on Gore Rd. All the properties fronting Gore Rd about a mile in either direction and across the road are designated ARL but they are 5 acre parcels, 2.5 acre parcels, and to the west directly adjacent to Mr. Chartrey's property it goes back to RDD-10. Those lots have been divided into one and two acre lots. A block of 70 acres lies to the southwest of his property and it is RDD-5. All he is requesting is he is treated fairly because all the properties that front Gore Rd have five or ten acre designations. If he has to be in ARL, he would like to be a five or ten acre designation.

Mr. Chartrey stated he was turned down to go to RDD-10 which makes sense. Commissioner Tausch had stated a couple of months ago that anything under 20 acres should not be considered ARL.

Mr. Chuck Maduell spoke on behalf of Forecastle Timber Company, Application #156. He stated this is an amended proposal to re-designate approximately 40% of the Forecastle Lands to a different Forest Lands designation: Forest Land of Local Importance. The re-designated lands would remain as forest resource lands; they would continue to be subject to development regulations and zoning restrictions that currently apply to forest resource lands. The only difference would be a little more density. It would allow one dwelling unit per 20 acres instead of the current one dwelling unit per 80 acres. The remaining 60% of the Forecastle Lands would keep its current designation of Forest Resource Lands of Long Term Commercial Significance with one additional protection: no residential uses would be allowed on those lands, even though current designation allows one dwelling unit per 80 acres. As a condition of the rezone, the land would be locked up in perpetuity as forest reserve.

The net effect of this re-designation is to increase density by 8 potential residences. The current zoning allows 25 residences on 80-acre lots and the proposed zoning would allow 33 residences on 20 acre lots. The difference would be instead of being spread out over 2200 acres on the hill, they would be more concentrated in the 40% of the lands closest to the lake. There would be only 8 additional lots and no impact on forest resource lands because they would be subject to the same zoning restrictions that currently apply.

The issue is not whether any of the Forecastle lands should be removed from the forest resource land designation. The issue is which forest resource land designation is the more appropriate. We think the split designation we have proposed, 40% of local importance and 60% retained as forest reserve is the most appropriate, consistent with the GMA and Lewis County policies governing the conservation of forest resource lands.

It will prohibit any residential uses on the higher elevation lands, those that are best suited for long term commercial forestry and it will allow limited incidental residential uses on the lands closes to Mineral Lake and Mineral Creek that are least suitable for long term forestry purposes. We ask that the Planning Commission recommend the proposed re-designation.

Commissioner Davis asked if Mr. Maduell believes that the re-designation for 8 units would fit with the mindset of the folks who put the growth management act together in Washington.



Mr. Maduell stated yes. He stated there are other counties that have as their maximum density 20 acre lots for their forest resource lands and those have been upheld by the Growth Management Hearings Board.

Commissioner Guenther stated when the 40% is shown for development there are dots on the map and he asked if those are the locations of the building sites. Mr. Maduell stated yes.

Commissioner Guenther asked what would be the footprint of each site. Mr. Maduell stated they are proposing that the footprint be limited. Even though these are 20 acre lots the residential use is only an incidental use. The remainder of the lot must still be available for forestry uses.

Commissioner Guenther asked if those would be 2-4,000 square feet. Mr. Maduell stated he did not know.

Mr. Johnson stated this is not project review, it is a zoning review and some of these questions are relative to development of the property.

Commissioner Guenther stated it would make a difference in his decision.

Mr. Maduell stated they had proposed that they identify a small residential use area on each 20-acre lot and through CC and R would limit residential uses on the remainder of the lot, that it would remain available for forestry uses.

Commissioner Tausch stated earlier there was reference to 20 acre parcels and whether they could be subdivided in the future. He understood that there was a process for that and asked if Mr. Maduell could expand on that.

Mr. Maduell stated the idea of opting is a misnomer. There is no opt in and there is no opt out because Forestcastle wants either to be or not to be forest resource land. Even if the BOCC re-designates 40% of these lands to forest land of local importance, they will remain forest resource lands and they cannot be removed as such unless the BOCC determines that they no longer meet the criteria for either category of forest resource lands. This re-designation does not promote more density. There are no special provisions for forest resource lands of local importance that allow any more than 20-acre density than is allowed for forest resource lands of commercial significance. There does appear to be a process in the code for subdivision and clustering in forest resource lands and could allow lots as small as 10 acres but that provision applies to the forest resource lands right now as they are currently designated. By re-designating these lands to forest resource lands of local importance there is no precedence to make it easier to further subdivide the lands. The minimum lot size would be 20 acres.

There was no further testimony. Chairman Jennings closed the oral portion of the public hearing. She stated written testimony can be submitted until close of business on October 19, 2010 to Community Development, 2025 NE Kresky Avenue, Chehalis.

Chairman Jennings recessed the meeting and reconvened at 8:40.

#### C. Public Hearing on Countywide Planning Policies and Population Allocation

Mr. Johnson stated the county under the Growth Management Act is required to adopt Countywide Planning Policies (CWPP) in collaboration with the cities. Lewis County does that through the Planned

Growth Committee (PGC). This committee consists of elected officials of the cities and meets regularly with the Board of County Commissioners and staff. The purpose of those meetings is to revise and amend the CWPPs that govern all land use development. The comprehensive plans of the cities and the county must be consistent with the CWPPs.

The PGC also establishes allocations for the rural and city populations for a 20-year horizon. Those projections were adopted in 2007 to go through 2025 and there is no change being proposed to those allocations.

There are some proposed changes to the CWPP and a summary of those follows section 1.0, 1.1 and 1.2 which are specific to adding language that would authorize the designation of an industrial area under RCW 36.70A.368. That is legislation that was put into the GMA last year which designates an area along the I-5 corridor that used to be a coal mine, the Trans Alta Industrial Park site. In order to adopt comprehensive plan changes to designate that area, the CWPP need to be changed to have consistent language.

Section 1.12.4 is being stricken because it is in the County Comprehensive Plan and does not need to be in the CWPPs.

Section 1.12.6 is policy language that would authorize the establishment of non-municipal urban growth areas necessary for the south county Subarea Plan.

Section 2.6 is a clarification of the existing policy as is Section 3.2.

Section 5.8 deals with the industrial park at Trans Alta and policy language relative to designation of that industrial area.

Section 12.1a has to do with utilities within the south county Subarea Plan and policy language authorizing development of a regional utility system to service any non-municipal urban growth area that may be established there.

That summarizes the changes to the CWPP. The populations allocations adopted in 2007 are still appropriate. What is needed now is a public hearing to take testimony on these proposed changes and action is necessary by the Planning Commission to make a recommendation and transmittal to the BOCC. That would take place at the October 26 workshop.

Mr. Johnson asked if there were any questions relative to the CWPP or population allocation.

An unidentified speaker referred to the population allocations and asked if there is someplace that shows where the populations are allocated.

Mr. Johnson stated yes, they are shown in the CWPP and they are also in the comprehensive plan for the various cities and their urban growth areas and for the county. They are based on the Office of Financial Management projections under GMA through the census information and population growth. The county through the PGC and CWPP determine how the population is allocated rural and urban and how much the cities are allocated for growth for the next 20 years.

The speaker asked for a definition of "allocation".

Mr. Johnson stated if the population is projected for the next 20 years to be 90,000 for Lewis County, then the PGC determines how much of that population should be in the urban areas, how much should be in the rural areas and how much each city is expected to grow. The focus is to plan for that kind of development based on the anticipated growth and those population projections.

The anticipated growth rate requires that the cities and the county do their land use, utility, transportation and capital facility planning relative to the anticipated growth.

The speaker asked if that is a limitation on growth.

Mr. Johnson stated it is not a limitation; it is based on historic patterns. The intent is when the long range comprehensive planning is being done to anticipate the kind of growth that there will be and plan for utilities, transportation improvements, schools, fire and everything that is necessary to support that growth so everyone understands what is needed and can address the costs associated with doing that and determine how it will be funded. The Growth Management Act was put into place because growth was taking place without any consideration as to the costs associated with that development.

Mr. Johnson stated the cities have their own comprehensive plans and their population projections.

Question: How do the cities fall outside of the county's realm?

Mr. Johnson stated the cities have their own municipal corporations and they have their own statutory authority. The county has no authority in the cities to act on land use, utilities, etc.

Question: Don't they also receive county tax dollars?

Mr. Johnson stated he is unable to answer that question. He asked Mr. Carter to comment.

Mr. Carter stated there are different sources of funding for municipal corporations and counties. Municipal corporations typically get more of their funding from sales tax and a very small portion of that goes to the county. Property taxes go primarily to the county but some of that goes to the municipal corporations. There are other kinds of funding that cities have such as utility taxes and it is not a source of revenue for the county. The cities sales taxes have fallen quite a bit in the past few years while property taxes tend to remain fairly uniform.

Commissioner Mahoney asked the approximate population in the county today.

Chairman Jennings stated it is 79,500 approximately.

Commissioner Mahoney stated there is a conflict in the two proposals. The Subarea plan is projecting 15,000 people by 2030. On the population projection chart there is only a total of 13,000 countywide. Looking at the projections there was not enough growth concentrated in the south county Subarea. There should be some correlation between the two things.

Ms. Kincaid stated with the south county subarea plan we are not projecting based on the OFM population because it is not a residential plan. We are creating economic development areas for employment and we are extrapolating population through job creation. There is not a historic trend line

that we are using through the OFM process. The Subarea Plan process will need to go back through the Planned Growth Committee and reconsider the re-allocation of some of that rural and urban population numbers.

Commissioner Mahoney stated what is being projected is a loss of over 3,000 citizens in the rural area and a 16,000 increase in the urban areas by 2030, a small part of that will come through in increased UGA size. It is realistic to say that the rural population of Lewis County, if we hold our present zoning, is actually going to decrease. If there is going to be any significant growth in the unincorporated areas we would have to look at more RDD-5 and RDD-10 zoning than what we have now. It concerned him that the numbers were not adding up and we are dealing with two different issues. He hoped we are using the same set of statistics.

Mr. Johnson stated the population allocations that are provided by OFM have to do with residential densities and where the houses are going to go. Historically, with current population growth, you are going to see reapportionment of the population to urban areas because Commissioner Mahoney is correct: as soon as the UGA are designated, those are typically annexed into the cities along with the populations. If you have a low population growth rate you will see the rural population shift into becoming urban population.

Mr. Johnson continued to say that what we are trying to do in the south county area is to establish areas for businesses and there may not be a concurrent residential component to that that is different from what is already adopted. We will have to see how that correlates to population and then look at it with the Planned Growth Committee to see if there are any changes that need to be made.

There were no more questions and Chairman Jennings opened the public hearing on the Countywide Planning Policies and Population Allocations. She asked for testimony.

There was no testimony and the Chair closed the public hearing. Written testimony may still be submitted until 5:00 p.m. on October 19, 2010 to Community Development at 2025 NE Kresky Avenue, Chehalis, WA.

### **III. New Business**

#### **B. Set Schedule for Comp Plan Text and Code Amendments**

October 26 will be the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop on the Comp Plan and the Industrial Park at Trans Alta IPAT). Chairman Jennings stated a special meeting needs to be set for November 3. She asked Mr. Johnson if he realized that was a Wednesday. Mr. Johnson stated he was aware of that. Tuesday, November 2 is election day and he did not think a Planning Commission meeting should be held on election day.

November 3 will be the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop on the Comp Plan and IPAT.

November 23 will be the 3<sup>rd</sup> workshop on the Comp Plan and IPAT.

The Chair stated a public hearing needs to be set for November 9 for the Comp Plan and IPAT. Commissioner Bill Russell moved to set the public hearing for November 9. The motion was seconded and the motion carried.

Ms. Kincaid clarified that the Comprehensive Plan amendment workshop would include the IPAT comp plan designation and text language and accompanying development regulations. You will also see text

amendments to the county comprehensive plan to the land use element, capital facilities and utilities and economic development elements. Those will have amendments that will authorize IPAT as well as the county owning and operating the Vader water system utility and also to authorize the south county plan. We will not bring the south county plan to you; however a revision to the policy language is needed to authorize that.

Commissioner Russell asked when the Planning Commission would see the revisions. He asked if there would be time to review them prior to the meeting.

Ms. Kincaid stated there will be a lot of reading and she anticipates getting all of the text amendments to the Planning Commission in the mail in the next day or two. There will be a reformatted land use element; the rural and urban elements will look completely different.

Chairman Jennings stated she would like to receive it this week so there is time to review it and have valid comments and questions on it.

Commissioner Mahoney asked when the final recommendations would be made on the rezones.

Ms. Kincaid stated it would be on October 26.

#### **IV. Calendar**

The next meeting is October 26 which will be the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop on the Comp Plan as described above, the Letters of Transmittal on the CWPP and Population Allocation and the Toledo UGA.

There will also be the final workshop and letter of transmittal on the rezones.

#### **V. Good of the Order**

No one wished to speak.

Chairman Jennings thanked Ms. Kincaid for her time and efforts over the years and stated she would be missed.

#### **VI. Adjourn**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Adjournment was at 9:05 p.m.